UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

vs. 03-CR-64

RAFIL DHAFIR,

Defendant.

-----x

Transcript of a Sentencing held on
October 27, 2005, at the James Hanley Federal
Building, 100 South Clinton Street, Syracuse,
New York, the HONORABLE NORMAN A. MORDUE, United
States District Judge, Presiding.

APPEARANCES

For The Government: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

P.O. Box 7198

100 South Clinton Street

Syracuse, New York 13261-7198
BY: MICHAEL C. OLMSTED, AUSA
GREGORY A. WEST, AUSA
STEPHEN C. GREEN, AUSA

For Defendant:

AIELLO & CANNICK Attorneys at Law 69-06 Grand Avenue

Maspeth, New York 11378

BY: DEVERAUX CANNICK, ESQ.

JOEL S. COHEN, ESQ. Attorney at Law 11 East Broadway

New York, New York 10038

PHILIP M. GAYNOR, ESQ.

Attorney at Law 551 Fifth Avenue

Suite 222

New York, New York 10176

2.2 MR. OLMSTED: We have all of those documents, 23 24 your Honor.

MR. CANNICK: We do, your Honor.

25

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Cannick, I'm sure you have an exception to the order.

MR. CANNICK: Absolutely, your Honor. And

24

25

	Case 5:03-cr-00064-NAM Document 684 Filed 01/08/08 Page 4 of 44
	USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing 4
1	your Honor, well, maybe I'm getting ahead of the Court, so
2	I'll just wait.
3	THE COURT: All right. Lastly, do you agree
4	with the criminal history computation that is set forth,
5	criminal history category I?
6	MR. OLMSTED: The Government does, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: I'm sure you do.
8	MR. CANNICK: Yes, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: All right. In that case, I'm
10	ready to hear arguments for downward departures.
11	MR. CANNICK: Your Honor, before we go to
12	downward departure, I said I had something with respect to
13	the guideline calculations.
14	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
15	MR. CANNICK: That I thought were two issues
16	that were still remaining. One is the enhancement with
17	respect to national security, and the other was the abuse of
18	trust enhancement. The abuse of trust, your Honor, we have
19	objection to that and I think we articulated that in our
20	overall papers. But we would like to speak more directly to
21	the enhancement with respect to national security.
22	THE COURT: That was the enhancement on
23	2S1.1(b)(1) of the Guidelines.

25

MR. CANNICK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead, sir.

1			MI	R. CAI	NNIC	K: Your I	Honor,	Ιt	hink	that	1İ	the
2	Court	is	relying	upon	the	documents	s that	wer	e pro	vided	. to	it

3 by the Government, I think that reliance would be wholly

4 misplaced. I think that it's a situation wherein the

5 Government in its papers made reference to the Court could

6 either rely on the testimony that was adduced at trial or it

7 | could rely on the documents itself. In our correspondence to

8 the Court dated October 4th, 2005, we pointed out that the

9 documentation that the Government was relying on, these were

notes that were taken by Dr. Dhafir as he was being debriefed

11 by someone who had inside information with respect to

12 | Kurdistan and basically the individuals that the Government

referenced in those papers, in its papers, individuals that

14 Dr. Dhafir supposedly met and interviewed.

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Basically, there was no meeting, there was an interview of several individuals and those interviews took place back in 1980, at least 20 years before the facts and circumstances of this case. The individuals that were referenced, the individuals that were referenced by the Government as being the founder of al fader and the prime minister of the Taliban is just factually in fact not the case. Those people were not in that capacity, in fact the individual that was referenced as being the prime minister of the Taliban, in fact our research tells us that the individuals were ran out of the country by the Taliban, and

the Government relying upon information that the Government, United States Government back in 1980 was supporting and sponsoring these individuals in Afghanistan in its effort to run the Soviet Union out of Afghanistan, and Dr. Dhafir had an interview with these individuals back in 1980 and the interview on the tape, the videotape that was provided to this court spoke about the humanitarian issues that were going on in Afghanistan.

And I think that to rely upon interviews that were taken in 1980 and saying that that's somehow compromised by the doctor sending humanitarian aid to Iraq in the 19 -- late 1990s and early 2000, when you put those two together seem not to make any sense, and certainly in no way create a national security issue.

And when you look at the documentation that was provided to the Court, the debriefing, basically one individual was giving Dr. Dhafir information with respect to individuals in Kurdistan and then there was a reference in the Government papers that, well, clearly this shows that he was giving moneys because there's a reference to HTN to give moneys to Islamic organizations, that's the distinction that we were hoping that the Government would in fact make on the paper because in one sense they were arguing he was giving moneys to Islamic groups but when you translated the document from its Arabic language to English, it says Islamic

2.2

organization, the Islamic group that they were talking about was in fact a group at some point, may have been a group out of Egypt that the doctor never had any involvement with. He had, in reference to the notes, Jamaa Islamia, a Kurdistan group. And when that group was put on the prohibitive list by the United States Government, Dr. Dhafir had long been in jail. So I don't see how the Court could rely upon that and make a decision to give that enhancement without having further information from the Government. It's their burden.

The Government relies on McKeeve and McKeeve is a case that basically speaks to an individual sending computer parts to -- into a foreign country and -- in Libya, knowing full well that those computer parts were going to be used for munitions purposes. McKeeve makes an exception for humanitarian aid. The only testimony that this court received, the credible testimony this court received with respect to whatever Dr. Dhafir and Help the Needy was sending into Iraq was for humanitarian purposes. McKeeve makes an exception for humanitarian purposes.

For those reasons, we object to the enhancement and we think that the information that was provided by the Government was wholly misleading. In fact, as we get to pointing out some of the misleading information that the Government gave to the Court in its sentencing memorandum, some of them are minor and innocuous but they're

2.2

misleading and erroneous nonetheless, and as I read the sentencing memorandum about -- that the Government submitted, it's like the facts be damned, we don't care what the true facts are, we're just going to put it here to support our argument.

They started off by saying Dr. Dhafir came to the United States in 1974. Well, the probation report and all the documentation that the Government has on Dr. Dhafir showed that he came here in 1972. Then, it gets worse where they speak about, Waleed Smari testified that Dr. Dhafir requested him to go to visit someone in Iraq. That's not the case at all. Waleed Smari testified that he was in the area and Dr. Dhafir said, well, if you're there, see this particular individual.

But I want to speak more specifically to glaring misstatements, total disregard for the facts that the Government put in its sentencing memorandum. One, they said that on Page 12, regarding Colleen Williams, they said that when his answers, as being Dr. Dhafir, "When his answers were vague and inconsistent and when they were contradicted by certain underlying documents and by Rafil Dhafir's answers to the same questions in her meeting with him, she withdrew from the work and sent the draft forms to Dhafir's -- to Mr. Hatfield."

The Court knows that that's not in fact the

case. Miss Williams told us in testimony that because the Government cornered her and waved the flag for some two or three days with her, she decided at that point in time that she had no intention to going further with the case. In fact she said that when she met with Dr. Dhafir, she wasn't even paying attention to what he said because she had made up her mind that she was going to withdraw. And to put this in the paper, to urge your Honor to sentence Dr. Dhafir, it just, it just — it's just patently unfair and intellectually dishonest.

When you go further, it mentioned that, well, this investigation of Dr. Dhafir as it relates to Medicare, in conducting physical surveillance of Dr. Dhafir's house during May 2000, investigators noticed that Rafil Dhafir seldom went to his medical practice. He spent several hours at his office on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, but did not go to his office on Thursdays and Fridays. Because his income tax returns revealed substantial income from the medical practice, investigators became suspicious of his billing practice with Medicare. You recall the testimony. They said it was a fax from Laurie Evans to Mrs. Dhafir, communication between those two individuals that spoke to the incident to rule, and it was because of that misunderstanding with respect to the incident to rule, that's how the Medicare case got started.

Now, they submit this to your Honor, and when we know full well that the documents that they gave us early on, they said, in those documents, that the Medicare investigation of Dr. Dhafir came as a result of FBI asking Medicare to conduct the investigation because they said that Dr. Dhafir was overbilling Medicare, bilking Medicare and using those moneys to sponsor terrorism. Now we have this. They're all over the place and it's the facts be damned, and we just ask your Honor to take some of these things in consideration.

We went through their sentencing memorandum and there are 44 instances of glaring misstatements or just intellectually dishonest information. One of the latter ones that speaks to the issue of fine or restitution, giving the information about the defendant's financial condition set forth in the presentence investigation report, "We agree with the probation office that defendant is in a position to pay such financial obligations immediately." What's so glaring about that, your Honor, is that it was only until last week that we faxed over the financial affidavit. There was nothing in the probation report. They just took the information and make things up as they went along as they did throughout the trial.

We are not here to relitigate the trial, but I just wanted the Court, when it relies on information that is

2.2

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

being submitted by the Government, that I think the Court has
to look at it with a very jaundiced eye. As it relates to
the issue with respect to enhancement of national security,
we urge your Honor to consider our letter dated October 4th,
2005.

THE COURT: I read it.

MR. CANNICK: We ask your Honor to consider the testimony that was heard at trial, and consider the fact that the information in those documents that were cited by the Government does not stand for the proposition, and some of the physical evidence that they ask your Honor to consider deals with interviews taken by Dr. Dhafir in 1980, of individuals who were fighting and being sponsored by the United States Government to rid the Soviet Union, rid Afghanistan of the Soviet Union. And again, our issue with respect to abuse of trust, we rely on our earlier papers.

THE COURT: Mr. Olmsted, would you like to

THE COURT: Mr. Olmsted, would you like to respond.

MR. OLMSTED: I'll respond very briefly unless you have more questions, then of course I'll answer any questions you would want.

With respect to Colleen Williams, and I won't belabor the record on this, I hope the Court --

THE COURT: I recall her testimony.

MR. OLMSTED: Is that she was stuck with Rafil

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

12

Dhafir longer than she would have otherwise done because she was concerned that the Government was overreaching and so she said, I gave them more breaks than normal, but it was when he pulled out the file cabinet that showed years and years of operation where they had told her specifically they were a new organization that she began to feel uncomfortable and withdrew. That's the basis of our representations in the sentencing memorandum.

Let me speak briefly about the enhancement for national security. The two paragraphs that we cite on the McKeeve case I think resolve this issue. It says, "The embargo was an exercise of executive power, designed to deal with an extraordinary threat to national security." In this case, your Honor, the President specifically found in 1990 that the government, the actions and policies of the government of Iraq constituted an unusual and extraordinary threat to national security. And that was endorsed every six months following that, either by a report or a specific finding. I appreciate that a lot of the public thinks of this as a kind of a Republican thing, but most of the findings ever found under sanctions were signed by President Clinton. This wasn't a Democrat thing, this wasn't a Republican thing, it was a national security program that was -- that persisted.

There are problems with every sanctions

2.2

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

program, but the sanctions programs are an alternative to war, and therefore, they are essential to the national security of the United States, and the decision to violate those sanctions violates a national security control.

In the McKeeve case the court says, in essence, that ends the matter. As we read it, the enhancement applies to any offense that involves a shipment or proposed shipment that offends the embargo, whether or not the goods shipped are actually intended for some innocent use, and the Min case says the same. I believe that you can rely upon your recollection of the facts that were adduced at trial to conclude that Rafil Dhafir was not sending humanitarian aid into Iraq, he was sending money. And much of that money wasn't even designed to purchase humanitarian aid, some of it was. But the fact is, the restriction on money going into a country like Iraq is absolute, and the reason is that once it gets there, it is fungible and can be used for any purpose.

The President, all the Presidents involved in this case believed that we had to have an unwavering foreign policy, absolute and controlling with respect to Iraq, both with respect to the government of Saddam Hussein and with respect to the factions that would succeed Saddam Hussein once he left power. And so they decided as a matter of national policy, as a matter of national security policy to

2.2

invoke these sanctions. And the conspiracy to violate those is a conspiracy to violate a national security control as a matter of law, and in this case as a matter of fact.

And we'll also remind you that you have resolved this issue on two further occasions with respect to two individuals, Osameh Al Wahaidy and Ayman Jarwan, both of whom we concluded believed that they were providing nothing but humanitarian aid, and it would be a perversion if Rafil Dhafir were to get the benefit of a -- or would not get this enhancement, when he knew the truth, given that those two individuals had to face that enhancement with aid or not. If you have --

THE COURT: Well, just because I did that with the other two doesn't mean I can't change my mind if I feel I erred, but I don't feel I erred, I think I was correct in that and you may have an exception, Mr. Cannick.

MR. CANNICK: Thank you, your Honor. I just want to correct the record with one thing that Mr. Olmsted said. He said with respect to Colleen Williams that she said she withdrew when Dr. Dhafir opened a drawer and she saw these articles or these items in the drawer. If the Court recalls that interview that Dr. Dhafir had with Colleen Williams was at Colleen Williams' office, she was not in Dr. Dhafir's office and Dr. Dhafir never opened any drawer, that was testimony of Ayman Jarwan.

1 MR. OLMSTED: Right, it was Ayman Jarwan.

THE COURT: All right. Now we're ready on the issue of downward departures. Defense, do you wish to be heard on that? I've read your papers.

MR. CANNICK: Your Honor, you've read our papers on it, we're not going to belabor the record, we just believe that given the facts and the circumstances of this case, this case is wholly outside of the heartland of cases that this court deals with on a day-to-day basis. I think that when I make my final comments to you with respect to Dr. Dhafir in terms of asking you or at least speak to you about the sentencing options, I will get further into it, but I think this case is out of the heartland. We cited a number of circumstances where, for charitable purposes, downward departure has been granted, we cited situations wherein someone, facts and circumstances of the case, the criminal conduct is far outweighed by the Guidelines, we'd ask you to take that in consideration.

We'd ask you to take into consideration that the law, the federal law anticipates that when someone's a pretrial detainee, that he will be kept in a federal facility, not like the one that Dr. Dhafir was kept in, and I think that this court is keenly aware of the conditions that Dr. Dhafir and his attorneys were confronted with in terms of preparing for this case on a going-forward basis. We also

2.2

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

point out the fact that he has lost his medical license, his standing in the community, these are all items that the courts have considered and granted downward departure on.

The Court has received our papers, since August 15th, you've indicated you've read them, so we're certainly not going to belabor the record here.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. COHEN: Your Honor, may I just take a moment to confer with Mr. Cannick.

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause in Proceedings.)

MR. CANNICK: And your Honor, Mr. Cohen just pointed out something that we did in fact discuss. That if this court was to give the enhancement with respect to the national security issue, then we would ask for a downward departure because of that, because this case is so much unlike the McKeeve case. In that case, McKeeve was aware that the computer parts were going to a munition facility, he understood and was aware because there were conversations had with he and the other individuals throughout him sending these items there that he fully appreciated his conduct, knew exactly what was going on. That's not the situation here.

Despite whatever the Government is saying, the only thing that we know that was going on is that Dr. Dhafir sent moneys to procure meat for the adahi program and to feed

2.2

other individuals and to provide medicine, clothe, food, I think the Court is well aware of their efforts to get clothing, the container into Iraq and that did go about and I would ask the Court to consider granting the downward departure to offset any enhancement that the Court might consider with respect to national security issues.

THE COURT: Mr. Olmsted.

MR. OLMSTED: Your Honor, obviously we oppose the downward departure on all these grounds. We do not believe that this case does fall outside the heartland. We believe that the shipment of money into Iraq, I believe you can recall the reports are that Iyad sent back, Mustafa, the two money couriers sent back to Rafil Dhafir to describe how they spent the money, does not match the humanitarian purposes that we are now hearing were the only purpose for the money being sent into Iraq. That's simply not the facts.

The only matter that they address that we have not already addressed on the record because I'll rely on our record otherwise, is the location of the defendant's pretrial detention. As you may know, we had suggested that the defendant could be moved to several other facilities to be convenient either to his lawyer by moving to a federal facility nearer to New York City or to another facility other than Jamesville in this area, and it was the defendant's choice to not seek those transfers. I believe because -- for

18

	ODA V. Ralli Bhalli Beneeneing
1	whatever reason, but I just wanted that to be on the record.
2	That he was not held in Jamesville because the Government
3	required him to be in Jamesville, he was held in Jamesville
4	because he was required to be held somewhere and that
5	Jamesville was the place chosen by the defense to stay.
6	Other than that, unless you have questions
7	about specific issues on which you are considering a downward
8	departure, I'll rely upon the papers that we've filed
9	already.
10	MR. CANNICK: Just want to correct the record,
11	your Honor, maybe I came in here one day and I was fast
12	asleep and I asked the Court to keep Dr. Dhafir at Jamesville
13	and maybe I asked for that, I don't have any recollection of
14	that whatsoever. I don't think that there's anything in the
15	record anywhere that would ever support that. Even numerous
16	letters that I sent to this court regarding what was going on
17	with respect to the facility, we complained loud and we
18	complained early.
19	THE COURT: And I think we accommodated you
20	pretty well, I think we I tried.
21	MR. CANNICK: With what you had.
22	THE COURT: With what I had.
23	MR. CANNICK: But we didn't ask for him
24	Mr. Olmsted just said I asked for him to be at Jamesville,
25	no, we said that the situation at the Justice Center and he

1 was summarily taken from the Justice Center, so -- but I think, your Honor, the record and the numerous letters that I 2 3 sent to the Court would bear us out, I'm not going to belabor this. 4 5 THE COURT: Just one second, please. (Pause in Proceedings.) 6 THE COURT: Okay. I'm ready to impose the 7 Government, do you move sentence at this time? 8 sentence. 9 MR. OLMSTED: Yes, we do, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: You wish to be heard? 11 MR. OLMSTED: Yes, we do, your Honor. We'll be brief because the papers that were submitted in 12 13 anticipation of sentencing have been voluminous and I believe provide you adequate information to impose a sentence. I 14 15 would like to make a couple points simply for the record, and 16 also because I believe that they bear keeping in mind during 17 the imposition of sentence. 18 This case is in several respects an unusual 19 case but in one major respect it is a normal case and that 20 is, it was built on the evidence fact by fact, that's why it 21 took so long to try this case. 2.2 There has been some public sentiment, we

There has been some public sentiment, we believe not shared in this case that we have targeted Rafil Dhafir for prosecution because of his religious beliefs.

That is not the case. We have litigated that pretrial, I

23

24

25

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

believe that as you watched the evidence unfold during trial, that concern should have evaporated. We have not prosecuted this case because of who the defendant is but because of what he has done.

And what has he done? We believe he has lied and we believe we have proved and the jury verdict confirms that he lied to his donors, to the United States, to his government, which is the United States government. He's convicted of making false statements to the IRS, to the INS, and to the Department of Human Services -- Health and Human Services. He's lied to his banks and we believe he's lied to his friends. He pretended, as you know, to be Maher Zagha, Maetham Alazawy, Muhammed Harairi, Ralph Shafir, and Osameh Al Wahaidy. His application for a visa to the Saudi Arabian government, he signed in the name of Ralph Shafir. And the videotape, if you recall, of the meeting in Washington, D.C. shows him and the other two trustees laughing at how they had misled the IRS on who they were. I believe his quotation is, "They'll be pulling out their hair trying to find us."

The testimony also showed that when anybody ever questioned him about what he was doing, he beat them down, insisting that they simply do what he asked.

He did when his wife told him that they were misbilling Medicare and now she's convicted.

He told Al Wahaidy that he needed to keep his

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

name on the bank accounts and Al Wahaidy agreed because of his loyalty to the doctor. And now, Al Wahaidy's been convicted.

When Jarwan met him in the parking lot, this is testimony at trial, and asked him, what happens to the money when it gets to Iraq, Dhafir didn't answer, he said, don't you trust me? Well, Ayman Jarwan did trust him, and now Ayman Jarwan is convicted and in jail.

When Ahmed Ali said, I don't know if I can sign this visa application because it says we're going to pay him \$63,000 and I want to make sure that really happens, can you send me the money, Rafil Dhafir said, yes, I'll send you the money, just sign it. Ali signed it. Dhafir never sent him the money, and now Ali is convicted.

When the New York State Charities Bureau started following up on the Somali Relief organization and Help the Needy, Rafil Dhafir met with Ahmed Ali and said, close your charity. To tell --

THE COURT: Somali Relief fund.

MR. OLMSTED: Somali Relief fund. To tell someone who is providing aid to needy Muslims that he should close their charity so the government doesn't figure out what Rafil Dhafir is doing with his charity money puts the lie to the claim that this is being prosecuted because of Rafil Dhafir's faith.

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

I appreciate that many people see his adamance as religious conviction. We see it as simple arrogance. Even though the sanctions in this case have been the focus of most of the arguments made by the defense counsel, the mail fraud and wire fraud of the donors has always been a motivating force to the investigation and the prosecution. Indeed it was the statute which we relied on at the beginning of this case to justify why pen registers, tax exempt, tax disclosure orders and such matters.

We have taken our lead from the donors. When asked, all the donors said that they would be appalled and offended and angry if the donations were used for anything other than helping the needy people in Iraq. That was the basis of the wire and mail fraud charges, Counts 51 to 60 on which he has been convicted.

People who donated money at the Manlius fundraiser, and you may recall we showed the videotape of that fundraiser, each said when we interviewed them in February of 2003 that they would feel defrauded if their money did not go to the needy people in Iraq. Many of those people, your Honor, are in the room today.

At trial, we showed through the records that the money that was provided by those people at that meeting was deposited into the Oneida Savings Bank account in the name of Help the Needy by Rafil Dhafir and then, forging

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

Osameh Al Wahaidy's name, the money was transferred to Maher Zagha's account in Jordan. And then following e-mail direction from Rafil Dhafir to Maher Zagha, that money was then paid out first to Haifal Abdullah who is the gentleman who came down from Montreal to say he had been advanced \$65,000 and he was going to use it to pay Iraqi government officials on the Oil for Food program but decided since the Iraqi government didn't seem like it was there for the long term, he would simply take the money and live off of it in Montreal. And another \$213,000 was wire transferred from --by Maher Zagha at the direction of Rafil Dhafir to Saed Badawi, who is the co-owner of, and the president of Salt City International, a corporation here in Syracuse owned by Rafil Dhafir.

And if you recall the visa application that the defendant submitted to the Saudi Arabian government, he said I was going over to meet with Saed Badawi to set up an investment company. It had nothing to do with charity.

And so when imposing the sentence today, applying the law to these facts, we ask you to keep in mind, as I'm sure those donors have kept in mind, the images, the tragic images of those children who needed help and to also keep in mind that none of those children ever had a chance of getting any of the money that those donors thought those donors were giving. Unless you have further questions, I'm

1 done.

2.2

THE COURT: Nothing.

MR. OLMSTED: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Cannick.

MR. CANNICK: Your Honor, I'm going to speak briefly to some of the comments that were made by Mr. Olmsted because I just don't think the facts as we heard them bear out what he just said, none of the moneys went to the children and the children didn't stand a chance of receiving it. I think that I can recall the testimony of Mr. Kolbe saying, well, most of the moneys went for the adahi program and that program was well documented and that was almost 70 percent of the moneys that the organization had, as well as the other holidays where the organization sent moneys for specific things.

Mr. Olmsted mentioned there are people in this community, in this room who were in attendance at the Manlius meeting and said that they felt betrayed if they knew the moneys went to some source other than that. I don't recall any of them testifying at trial, in fact there are witnesses who the Government did in fact have testify at trial and they asked the very same question of them, and those witnesses did not give the statement or comment that Mr. Olmsted just made. In fact, most of the discovery that we received with respect to communications that supposed victims responded to the

2.2

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

Government regarding the use of the moneys, at least their allegation of the use of the moneys, they were not as which was just articulated by Mr. Olmsted.

The ones who testified here in court didn't articulate that, nor did the ones who sent written correspondence back in response to them. It's quite contrary. In fact most of them said that they believe that Dr. Dhafir, knowing who he was, used the moneys for the purposes for which he asked, and the witnesses who came and testified here in court said the exact same thing.

The Government opened up this case on that theme, that Dr. Dhafir would be shown to be a manipulator and a betrayer, and the people that they called and put on the witness stand said everything but that. In fact in their letter to your Honor, the sentencing memorandum, they said, well, because these people did not come in and said that he manipulated them and betrayed them that he must be some Svengali of some sort, has some powers over them where they couldn't realize what had happened to them.

THE COURT: Well, I got to say, there, his wife stands convicted before me, plus several of his colleagues.

MR. CANNICK: Yes.

THE COURT: And they're -- and I recall the testimony. There is an allegiance to your client by Osameh

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

Al Wahaidy, Ayman Jarwan, those people, and the wife, there is a strong, strong belief in him, and I think, and as it stands right now, they're all convicted as result of the conduct of your client.

MR. CANNICK: Your Honor, and what really concerns me about that comment is that when the Court says that, then the Court in my way of thinking is saying, well, if there's such a belief, then that belief is only there because of some nefarious ability of my client, not that he's such a person who's lived his life --

THE COURT: I didn't say, I'm just saying that they have a belief in him. He is a leader within his community, he is looked up to, highly respected, I didn't hear anybody speak in a derogatory manner about him, even the ones that stand convicted of felonies.

MR. CANNICK: And there's probably a reason for that. Because he is, because he's lived his life the way that he's represented himself throughout, and these people have reason to know him I think far more intimately than anyone else in this courtroom, and there's probably very good reason as to why that allegiance is there and that loyalty is there. And I think the way that these witnesses who came in and testified about what Dr. Dhafir did for them way back when, before there was any Help the Needy, you remember the testimony of the individual who came here to go to medical

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

Dr. Dhafir who came and gave him money to help him out of his situation. Witnesses after witnesses came in and testified as to the good deeds of this man, well before Help the Needy.

THE COURT: I know that, but there's also this side of it that's very bothersome to me. Your client has insulated himself, he has bank accounts, instead of his name being on them, they're in the name of Osameh Al Wahaidy, they're in the name of Ayman Jarwan, they're in the names of other people. He has insulated himself, his name shows up nowhere. Even when the prosecution mentioned, I mean, when he was going to go back over to Saudi Arabia, I think he used Ralph Shafir as the name.

MR. CANNICK: A name that he used for about 20 years, your Honor, and your Honor, I think that aside from -THE COURT: It just, it seems to me, I sat and

I heard the case, and I -- I'm of the opinion that he did many, many good things, there's no question about that, and I intend to take that into consideration when I sentence him, but he's been convicted, and I heard the proof and I heard the jury's verdict, and I think the evidence supported that and I told you that when the motions were made.

MR. CANNICK: Your Honor, then given what the Court has just said, I'm not going to belabor the Court's time with much more, but I think when you mention that there

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

are these individuals who are close to my client, who has this belief in him, I think that the Court should take into consideration, there aren't many letters that were received from supposed victims here, but the ones that were received, if the Court reads them, these letters speak glowingly about Dr. Dhafir.

THE COURT: I read every letter that was sent to me. There were a couple letters, though, that didn't speak so glowingly. He broke the hearts of some of his clients, that he worked on, you recall, because they questioned now whether or not he was honestly treating them for the cancer that they were going through, or treating their husbands, so I agree, overwhelmingly, they speak glowingly of your client, there is no question about that.

MR. CANNICK: And your Honor, I'd just like to mention two things and I'm going to sit down. You mentioned that there were a couple of letters that did not speak favorably of Dr. Dhafir and I have those two letters because I knew that there would be some reference to them. The one letter is from an individual, I'm not going to mention the name but the letter basically said, we had a big loss in our family, I blame Dr. Dhafir because when we needed him, he was in jail, we had no medical records to fall on, and we had no doctor to counsel on. Your Honor, that was pretty much Dr. Dhafir's position with respect to the Medicare issue

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

here. There was no other doctor there as it relates to incident to. They're saying that when we needed him, he was in jail.

The other letter's pretty much the same, and what went on is that the letter then goes on to speak about Dr. Dhafir, well, we're at war now, and he did these things to America, and we're a hundred percent Americans. I think the other letter speaks to a misunderstanding as to what this case is all about, and I think that person found themselves a victim --

THE COURT: She is mixed up, you can tell she's emotionally, she is -- it's a lengthy, lengthy letter, that one. The other one, is that the one where there's five children involved?

MR. CANNICK: This is the one that I just referenced. The one that you just spoke to is of a 85-year-old woman who was treated by Dr. Dhafir and still was alive 13, 15 years later, after she was treated with him with a 50/50 chance and this letter basically says he let us down because he was in jail.

Your Honor, I'm not going to belabor the record. You have our submissions, we have reason to believe that this case is outside of the heartland, we believe that the Government -- well, the Court is to consider the Guidelines, but Booker, you're supposed to consider the total

1	bent of a man, and we ask you that when you consider the
2	total bent of a man, you do what you feel is the right thing
3	to do here. Dr. Dhafir did not kill anyone, he did not maim
4	anyone, and we don't believe that he should be sentenced in
5	that fashion. If he did kill someone, he killed them out of
6	kindness, out of love, and out of trying to provide food and
7	humanitarian services for them. Thank you.
8	THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. One second.
9	(Pause in Proceedings.)
10	THE COURT: Okay. Rafil Dhafir, is there
11	anything you would like to say, sir, before I pronounce
12	sentence?
13	MR. CANNICK: May I have one second, your
14	Honor.
15	(Pause in Proceedings.)
16	THE COURT: Mr. West, did you advise counsel
17	of your different figure on the Blue Cross Blue Shield?
18	MR. WEST: I did, Judge, I provided
19	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, I'm sorry, Judge, may
20	we take a five-minute break in order to resolve this issue
21	with Dr. Dhafir? Thank you very much.
22	THE COURT: Five-minute break.
23	MR. CANNICK: Your Honor, before we go, am I
24	correct that the restitution issue is still open?
25	THE COURT: Well, I was going to address that,

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

I just wanted to know if the probation department has shown you what their figures are, and this morning, Mr. West submitted to our office and I just asked him whether you were advised of that, that they have lessened from 52,000 to 18,000. If you want, you can submit the restitution issue on papers afterwards.

MR. CANNICK: Your Honor, that I think would be our preference, because what probation has suggested here is totally at odds with the Government's own witness Nina Carosella with respect to Medicare, and we submitted Nina Carosella's testimony with our sentencing memorandum, and I don't know if the Court recalls her testimony, but she spoke about how these things had to be first backed out, and probation does not in any way do any backing out, and I don't think the Government is of that position when in fact its own witnesses said you had to back these things out. And I think that if we were to have any resolution of it, it has to be by way of a submission or by hearing.

MR. COHEN: Or both.

MR. WEST: Well, Mr. Cannick continues to misunderstand Miss Carosella's testimony. She explained that she was not in a position to go through the calculations because that was done by Special Agent Pangallo who went through and explained how she backed out the claims that were inappropriate to reduce the amounts that were concluded as a

_	
1	loss. What the Medicaid folks have submitted and that
2	Excellus Blue Cross Blue Shield has submitted now provides
3	the Court with the losses which they incur for the payments
4	that weren't made by Medicaid when Dr. Dhafir was out of
5	office and his staff treated the patients. They adopted the
6	same percentage reductions that Agent Pangallo did when she
7	did her analysis and their charts and figures reflect that.
8	The figures that we submitted this morning, and the new
9	charts that I provided.
10	THE COURT: You went from 52,015.55 to
11	18,336.27 on the Excellus Blue Cross.
12	MR. WEST: That's correct, Judge.
13	THE COURT: Well
14	MR. CANNICK: There's no misappreciation that
15	I have of Nina Carosella's testimony, you have it, it speaks
16	for itself.
17	THE COURT: Why don't I reserve then on the
18	restitution issue, we'll resolve this.
19	MR. CANNICK: Very well, your Honor. May we
20	have that 15 that five minutes.
21	THE COURT: Yes.
22	THE CLERK: Court stands in recess.
23	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, may we meet with the
24	doctor in the jury room?
25	THE COURT: Sure.

33

MR. COHEN: Thank you very much.

(Whereupon a recess was taken from 10:56 a.m.

3 to 11:05 a.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

4 THE COURT: Mr. Cannick, sir.

5 MR. CANNICK: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor,

Dr. Dhafir does have a statement he'd like to make.

THE COURT: Please proceed, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: (speaking in Arabic) Peace to Allah and peace and mercy be on his prophet and all the prophets after him, before him.

I have been incarcerated for close to a thousand days and counting. And I had to endure four months of trial where misrepresentation, innuendoes, and utter lies were uttered and I had to endure all this as I had no way of saying anything because of the structure of the system. And since the trial ended eight months ago, I've been thinking on what to say in this day that will explain some of the ambiguities or answer some of the questions that were raised even this morning just a few minutes ago, and I sat and wrote down and rewrote and rerererewrote, and I ended up with a document of about 50 pages that I wanted to present to this court today.

But then last night, meeting with my lawyers, they said that no one is going to have the attention span to listen to all this, including the Judge, and they convinced

2.2

USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing

me to cut it down to about five or six pages which I reluctantly did, knowing that a lot of facts are going to go unnoticed, and a lot of deceiving and deceptions that were shown during the trial by our accusers will go unchallenged, but because, again, of the way the system was, I agreed to it.

But then again, as the Court started this morning, and hearing your comments, sir, I found that even these five or six pages are not to be uttered, because it seems, and I could be corrected, that the Court's mind have already been set. My lawyers had advised me --

THE COURT: My mind is set on this, I accept the jury's verdict.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I am required to accept that jury's verdict.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. As my lawyers have pointed out to me as well as to others, is that common sense has to prevail. How would one explain that someone will pay \$1.4 million over the years and come up with such a complicated scheme which takes a lot of effort and a lot of footwork and tremendous cooperation from not one, two, three, or four people, so that at the end, he will steal \$300,000. It makes absolutely no sense. At least I should be given the benefit of the doubt that I'm not that dumb and not that

1 stupid.

2.2

common sense.

THE COURT: I think you graduated high school at the age of 16 number 10 of 45,000 students.

THE DEFENDANT: 45,000, sir.

THE COURT: I don't think you're stupid, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: To come up with that scheme and spend \$1.4 million to steal \$300,000 is to be dumb and I'm not that dumb. By simple calculation, as my lawyers have pointed out, that if the issue was to avoid taxes, I could have paid, and I did. But according to the Government, that I tried to avoid paying \$400,000. You are good at mathematics, sir, you showed us your capability, and I'm good at mathematics, too, I always scored a hundred out of a hundred in the 11 years that I studied mathematics. These things do not add up. I could have paid the alleged \$400,000 and kept a million in my pocket. I didn't have to steal that \$300,000 the Government alleges. Common sense. Simple

Apologies are in order. I first and foremost apologize to my Maker for not worshipping him the way he deserves and is entitled to.

I apologize to the Prophet, peace be upon him, for not emulating him as I should have.

I apologize to my wife, who was deprived of my companionship, and I of hers, because I was so entrenched in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing
```

helping the needy. I thank her for understanding and not complaining. I hope I will be able to make it up to her, if not in this life, then surely in the next.

I apologize to the Iragi people, those who were needy, for not helping more, but my hands were tied, and now I'm incarcerated.

I apologize to my Muslim brothers and sisters for not spending enough time helping them with their fears, and to them, I wish I can turn back and look them in the eye and talk to them, but I know the Marshals will not allow me, and tell them don't ever believe that I would let you down or that I would lie to you or that I will misappropriate the funds that you trusted me with. Not then, not now, not ever. It is not in me, and that is not me. Whatever else people from our accusers' side want to say, that's their problem. But the truth stands as it is.

I apologize also to those who have faith in me, supported me in all forms and avenues and who believe in my innocence. I apologize to them that I failed to convince the decision makers of my innocence, as I don't know how to lie and twist the facts, and I wish that what people believe on the outside is the same as what had been transpired inside this court. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Going to take about a three-minute recess, please.

THE CLERK: Court stands in recess.

(Whereupon a recess was taken from 11:14 a.m.

to 11:16 a.m.)

2.2

THE COURT: Okay. Rafil A. Dhafir, the Court has reviewed and considered all pertinent information including, but not limited to, the presentence investigation report, the addenda, the submissions by counsel, I've considered the factors outlined in 18 U.S.C. 3553(a) and the Sentencing Guidelines, and I adopt the factual information contained in the presentence report and the addenda.

enhancement to the money laundering counts under 2S1.1(b)(1), for promoting a national security offense. Likewise, the Court finds that the Level 26 under 2M5.1(a)(1) is appropriate on Count 1. The Court bases this conclusion on the trial testimony and the jury verdicts of guilt on counts relating to IEEPA violations. The Court does not rely on the notes and the other documents not admitted into evidence to which defendant objects.

Now the Court finds the total offense level to be 41, the criminal history category is I, and the guideline imprisonment range is 324 to 405 months.

The Court has considered the relevant factors in Section 5K2.0 of the Sentencing Guidelines, and finds that this case is not outside the heartland of cases. The Court

denies defendant's motion for a downward departure.

2.2

The Court must now consider the applicable guideline sentencing ranges as well as the other factors that are listed in 18 U.S.C. 3553(a). These factors include the pertinent Sentencing Commission policy statements, the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities, and the need to provide restitution to victims as well as the requirement that judges impose sentences that reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, provide just punishment, and afford adequate deterrence and protect the public. Also, the Court shall impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the above stated purposes of 3553(a).

In considering the 3553(a) factors, the Court recognizes that this defendant has never been involved with the criminal justice system in his 57 years. Additionally, the Court cannot overlook the highly favorable conduct of the defendant in the past. I have received many, many letters, overwhelming majority of which praise the defendant for his care to his patients and to their families.

The defendant has had a very positive influence within the Muslim community of Central New York. He has not only been a leader within the Muslim community, but he was the moving force behind the building of the mosque in Syracuse. It is unquestioned that he gave guidance,

shelter, clothing, jobs, and assisted in furthering the education of several newly arrived immigrants from the Middle East.

The Court is not unmindful of the fact that this defendant now stands before the Court stripped of his stature within the community, never to return to his practice of medicine, and knowing that his finances and assets are subject to forfeiture by the Government.

As such, it is the opinion of this court that a term of imprisonment of 27 to 30 -- nearly 34 years is not necessary to carry out the purposes of 3553(a). Taking into account all the required factors, the Court finds that the purposes of 3553(a) are satisfied by a sentence below that recommended by the Guidelines.

Accordingly, upon your conviction by jury trial of Counts 1, 2, and 4 through 60 of the fourth superseding indictment, it is the judgment of this court that you are hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 264 months. This consists of the following: Terms of 240 months as to each of Counts 2, 4 through 14, and Counts 53 through 60; terms of 120 months as to each of Counts 24 through 49; terms of 60 months as to each of Counts 1, 15, 17 through 23, and Counts 50 through 52; and a term of 36 months as to Count 16.

The terms on each of Counts 2, Counts 4

through 14, Counts 16 through 49, and Counts 51 through 60 1 2 shall all be served concurrently with each other. 3 The terms on each of Counts 1, 15, and 50 shall be served concurrently with each other and, on each of 4 which, 24 months shall be served consecutively to the 20-year terms imposed on Count 2, Counts 4 through 14, and Counts 53 6 7 through 60, for a total term of imprisonment of 264 months. The Court reserves decision on the issue of 8 9 restitution. The Court will consider any submissions 10 received on this issue on or before November the 11th, 2005. 11 Upon release from imprisonment, you shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. 12 13 consists of a term of three years on Counts 1, 2, 4 through 15, and Counts 17 through 60, and a term of one year on 14 15 Count 16, all such terms, again, to run concurrently. 16 While you are on supervised release, you shall 17 not commit another federal, state, or local crime, and you 18

shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court, and you shall comply with the following special conditions:

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One, you shall provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information;

And secondly, the Court has reliable information which indicates you pose a low risk of substance abuse, so the mandatory drug testing in your case is -- that

1 condition is suspended.

2.2

It is further ordered you shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$100 on each count for a total of \$5,900 which is due immediately.

So you are remanded at this time to the custody of the United States Marshal in accordance with the terms of this sentence.

Now both parties do have the right to appeal this verdict and sentence, in certain limited circumstances. You are advised to consult with your attorneys to determine whether or not appeal is warranted. Any appeal must be filed within 10 days of this sentence. Mr. Cannick, will you assist him in that regard?

MR. CANNICK: Yes, your Honor, we will file the necessary papers.

THE COURT: All right. That concludes this matter. Good luck to you, sir.

MR. CANNICK: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CANNICK: As the probation report indicates, Dr. Dhafir has no family other than Mrs. Dhafir in the Central New York area, community, Muslim community.

THE COURT: I'm going to make the recommendation to the Bureau of Prisons that they do house him in the closest facility to his home.

	USA v. Rafil Dhafir Sentencing 42
1	MR. CANNICK: Yes. And your Honor, hopefully
2	they would view that as the Otisville facility, we know
3	that
4	THE COURT: Otisville?
5	MR. CANNICK: Yes.
6	THE COURT: As opposed to Lake Placid?
7	MR. CANNICK: Lake Placid in terms of
8	Mrs. Dhafir being able to drive there, from my experience in
9	driving there
10	THE COURT: Easier ride, I understand.
11	MR. CANNICK: more dangerous ride.
12	THE COURT: I will recommend to BOP that they
13	house your client at Otisville.
14	MR. CANNICK: Thank you very much.
15	MR. OLMSTED: Your Honor, I just have a
16	question, and I'm not asking you to rethink it, but did you
17	impose a fine or did you find that no fine was necessary?
18	THE COURT: In regards to a fine, I find a
19	fine isn't warranted in light of the financial situation of
20	the defendant, and also interest on the judgment is suspended
21	in this case. Thank you for pointing that out to me.
22	MR. OLMSTED: I have one more thing for the
23	record, your Honor, if I may. It was our intention had
24	restitution been ordered today to be put into a final
25	judgment, that we would dismiss the forfeiture and the

remaining counts against Help the Needy and Help the Needy Endowment, Inc. and we will do so once the judgment is filed in this case, without any further argument or presentation. As you know, Help the Needy and Help the Needy Endowment, Inc. have been subsumed by the New York State Attorney General's Charities Bureau and so they have no real corporate existence anymore. The remaining charges will be dismissed as soon as the judgment -- we will seek to dismiss it. THE COURT: All right. MR. OLMSTED: Other than that, we're done. THE COURT: Thank you. THE CLERK: Court stands adjourned. (Court Adjourned, 11:25 a.m.)